

1. Improvement Over Time




Have Minnesota's 4th graders improved in reading achievement?

Yes. The percentage of Minnesota's public school 4th graders who met the Goals Panel's performance standard in reading increased from 31% in 1992, to 36% in 1998.

The Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement – Proficient or Advanced – on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, or NAEP.

Percentage of public school 4th graders at or above Proficient on the NAEP reading assessment



Reading performance will be tested again in 2002.

2. State Comparisons[†]

How did Minnesota compare with other states in 4th grade reading achievement in public schools in 1998?

1 state had a significantly higher¹ percentage of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

Connecticut 46%

10 states had similar¹ percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

New Hampshire	38%	Colorado, Kansas, Wisconsin	34%
Massachusetts, Montana	37%	Rhode Island	32%
Minnesota , Maine	36%	Wyoming ²	30%
Iowa	35%		

29 states had significantly lower¹ percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

U.S.* ²	Percentage	States/Territories	Percentage
Arkansas, Florida	23%		
Oklahoma, ² Virginia ²	30%	Arizona, New Mexico, South Carolina	22%
Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri,	29%	Nevada	21%
New York, Texas, Washington,		California	20%
West Virginia		Louisiana	19%
Michigan, North Carolina, Oregon,	28%	Mississippi	18%
Utah		Hawaii	17%
Delaware, Tennessee	25%	District of Columbia	10%
Alabama, Georgia	24%	Virgin Islands	8%

[†] The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories.


¹ See explanation on pp. 2-3.

² State may appear to be out of place; however, statistically its placement is correct. See pp. 2-3.

* Figure shown for the U.S. includes both public and nonpublic school data.

3. Subgroup Performance

What percentages of public school 4th graders in different subgroups¹ in Minnesota were at or above Proficient on the 1998 NAEP reading assessment?



¹ Interpret differences between subgroups with caution. See pp. 2-3 and Appendix D.

² Characteristics of the sample do not permit a reliable estimate.

³ No data reported for 4th graders by parents' highest level of education in 1998.


1. Improvement Over Time

Have Minnesota's 8th graders improved in reading achievement?

In 1998, 37% of Minnesota's public school 8th graders met the Goals Panel's performance standard in reading. Improvement over time will be reported when reading is assessed again in 2002.

The Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement – Proficient or Advanced – on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, or NAEP.

Percentage of public school 8th graders at or above Proficient on the NAEP reading assessment



Reading performance will be tested again in 2002.

2. State Comparisons[†]

How did Minnesota compare with other states in 8th grade reading achievement in public schools in 1998?

11 states had similar¹ percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:


Connecticut, Maine	42%	New York	34%
Montana	38%	U.S.* Oregon, Virginia, Wisconsin	33%
Minnesota	37%	Washington	32%
Massachusetts	36%	Maryland ²	31%
Kansas	35%		

26 states had significantly lower¹ percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

North Carolina, ² Utah ²	31%	Nevada, New Mexico	24%
Colorado, Rhode Island	30%	Arkansas, Florida	23%
Kentucky, Missouri, Oklahoma, Wyoming	29%	California, South Carolina	22%
Arizona, Texas	28%	Alabama	21%
West Virginia	27%	Hawaii, Mississippi	19%
Tennessee	26%	Louisiana	18%
Delaware, Georgia	25%	District of Columbia	12%
		Virgin Islands	10%

3. Subgroup Performance

What percentages of public school 8th graders in different subgroups¹ in Minnesota were at or above Proficient on the 1998 NAEP reading assessment?



[†] The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories.

¹ See explanation on pp. 2-3.

² State may appear to be out of place; however, statistically its placement is correct. See pp. 2-3.

* Figure shown for the U.S. includes both public and nonpublic school data.

¹ Interpret differences between subgroups with caution. See pp. 2-3 and Appendix D.

² Characteristics of the sample do not permit a reliable estimate.